

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/822,894	ELIAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Barry J. O'Brien	2183	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Pending

 (1) Barry J. O'Brien.

(3) _____.

 (2) William Schaal.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2004
Time: 12:45pm EST
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none.

Claims discussed:

6, 7, 11, 12 and 14

Prior art documents discussed:

none.


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 RICHARD L. ELLIS
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

N/A

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted the Applicant to resolve formal issues that arose with the Applicant's amendment that would put the case in condition for allowance. Specifically, the Applicant amended claim 7 to become an independent claim, but did not include the limitations of claim 7's previous parent claim, claim 6, and thus introduced a 35 U.S.C. 112 antecedent basis problem. Similarly, the Applicant amended claim 12 to become an independent claim, but did not include the limitations of the intervening claim 11, although no 112 problems were created and thus this was a suggested change and did not affect the allowability of the application. Furthermore, the Applicant did not respond or amend claim 14 to overcome the Examiner's previous grammatical objection. The Applicant agreed to make the above changes to claims 6, 7 and 14, thereby amending claim 7 to include the limitations of claim 6 and subsequently cancelling claim 6, as well as to amend claim 14 to fix the grammatical issue, but did not agree to move the limitations of claim 11 into claim 12, which does not affect the allowability of the application. He authorized the Examiner to make the agreed upon changes via Examiner's Amendment..